

SOMETHING.

EDITED

BY NEMO NOBODY, ESQUIRE.

"'Tis Something.....Nothing."

No. 16.]

Boston, Saturday, March 3, 1810.

[Vol. I.]

THEOLOGY.

*"Thou fair religion ! was design'd
Duteous daughter of the skies !
To warm and cheer the human mind,
To make men happy, good and wise.
To point where, sits in love arrayed
Attentive to each suppliant call,
The god of universal aid,
The god, the father of us all,
First drawn by thee, thus glow'd the heavenly scene,
Till superstition, fiend of woe !
Bade doubts to rise, and tears to flow,
And spread dark clouds, our view and heaven between ;
Drawn by her pencil the creator stands
(His beams of mercy thrown aside)
With thunder arming his uplifted hand ;
And hurling vengeance wide,
Hope at the frown aghast yet lingering flies,
And dash'd on terrors rocks faith's best dependence lies."*

PENROSE.

HAVE we indeed become worthy of anathemas from a certain pulpit, and yet are our errors so numerous, our knowledge of the scriptures so trifling, and our ignorance of theology so great, as to render us unworthy of a serious reply in writing ?

Does the professor of sacred literature think that he can content us by annotating on the margin of our work, "it is a scripture phrase"—when we enquired the meaning of the phrase "Heaven of Heavens ?"

does he suppose the subserviency of our own judgment so abject, as to submit to another marginal note that "sense of agency is nonsense or impiety when applied to God as F. would have it," or does he, as we are told he has asserted, contend that we have no religion at all?

Among the very numerous errors which the professor stated to exist in our review of Dr. Griffin's sermon we find none specifically pointed out. The remarks which he has favoured us with we notice, as we will all others he may be inclined to make, with due attention.

In the margin of No. 14, p. 214, we find written by the professor "*acquirements of God*, is saying he is not omniscient or has not been."

We cannot judge of the gentleman's motives for making this remark; we have a right however to presume that he in christian charity intended them for our inspection and instruction—with an equal spirit of benevolence we reply to them.

We had quoted the following passage from Dr. Griffin's sermon:

"In respect to his knowledge and agency he is omnipresent."

On this passage, we had remarked in the sentence underlined by the professor and to which his note was attached "*We had hitherto considered knowledge as an acquirement*," intending thereby to infer that the attribution of an acquirement to an originally omnipotent Being was in our opinion incorrect. On this *our* observation, the professor makes a remark which leaves only a point in dispute between Dr. Griffin and himself—for the professor and ourselves declare the same thing—viz. that to speak of the *acquirements* of God is to say that he is not omniscient or not been so.

"Sense of agency is nonsense or impiety, when applied to God as F. would have it."

This is the next annotation.—Now we should not scruple much to confess that we have sometimes written *nonsense*, but we will defend ourselves against the charge of impiety till we return our breath to God who gave it, and when we shall be convinced that we have written nonsense, it will be only by an argument that contains *some* sense.

The first note of the learned gentleman in No. 15, p. 225, is doubtless intended as instructive—we therefore thank him with all the humility of a man who has no right to a knowledge of theology because he is not installed as a professor.

In answer to our remark that we should be glad to be informed of the meaning of the phrase Heaven of Heavens, the professor of sacred literature most improvingly informs us, "It is a scripture phrase."

When such instruction is so voluntarily and explicitly given, who can be ungrateful? We bow with the respect due from ignorance to knowledge.

The next and last notice of our numerous errors is p. 227.—The shocking crime of which we are here sentenced as guilty, is marked thus with “double tongue of admiration;” “authority in form of a man”!! And can a theologian who advocates or passes over this sentence, “but now in the person of him in whom *dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*, the inhabitants of that world behold *God manifest in the flesh*—ridicule as absurd the following on which the annotation was made—“Are we therefore, because St. Paul declares that the divine authority was manifested to mankind in the form of a man,” &c.

Let us be permitted to ask the learned professor under what appearance Moses went to Pharaoh, and if the divine authority was not then made manifest in the form of a man when the Lord said to him “I make thee a God to Pharaoh?”

We have now remarked on all the notes with which the professor honoured our paper. If our ignorance be really so great as he esteems it, he will do an essential service to the public in exposing it still farther—we have copied faithfully all the notes that have come within our sight—his remarks from the pulpit we heard only by proxy, and perhaps too incorrectly communicated to justify our farther remarks at present. We will beg leave however to assure the preacher that we have *some* religion, and that our religion partakes so much of Christianity as to induce us to expect that *he* will not be damned because he differs from us in his opinions.

DR. GRIFFIN'S SERMON.

NOTES, we presume, are intended for the elucidation of sentences in the body of the work; but what is to be done when notes only tend to make confusion worse confounded. It will indeed require all the rhetoric of all the professors of sacred literature to convince us what possible justification can be obtained from the 18th verse of the 10th chapter of St. John to Dr. Griffin's idea, that the personal union of the human nature with the divine “is so intimate, that with the same lips and in the same sentence he can apply to both natures the same personal pronoun.”—What in the name of common sense, what in the name of plain, honest, simple religion can Dr. Griffin mean by this? We admit our ignorance, we cannot comprehend it—but while we are ready to acknowledge the profundity of the Doctor's researches we think that sermons should be calculated for vulgar comprehensions, the congregation should know what is meant by the preacher; it is his duty to explain not to confuse the scriptures.

He refers us to John x. 18, to prove this union he talks of so intimate, &c.—What union? our Saviour has talked of none.

Jesus has been representing himself, not as a hireling shepherd who would desert his flock in cases of extremity, but as a real owner who would protect his own property, as a father of a family who would sacrifice his life for them. He then observes in the verse to which the Doctor has referred us.

“No man taketh it (my life) from me, but I lay it down of myself; I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again—This commandment have I received of my Father.”

Who can tell where in this verse is inferred any thing like a personal union of the human nature with the divine.

Again the Doctor refers us to Acts xx. 28, to prove that “the sufferings of the human nature are as meritorious as though they had been the sufferings of the divine—the blood that was shed being the blood of God.” The Doctor may retain, if he pleases, his present opinions, we will only prove to our readers, as we think it our duty, that they are not warranted even by the passages to which he himself refers.

Indeed we see not in general how so many strange opinions should emanate from simple relations of poets.

The simple fact we conceive to be this—St. Paul having called the elders together says to them, after other advice—“Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood.” What more can by any scientific man be understood by this than a recommendation to the elders to encourage the religion which Christ died to establish, in its original simplicity, labouring “to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, it was more blessed to give than to receive.”

The third inferred or explanatory meaning of this assertion, “That body belongs to one in whom the human nature is raised to a personal union with the divine,” is “that the same person that *suffered*, has the reward of governing the universe and bringing his people to glory: all of which cannot be predicated of either nature exclusively.”

All these inferences, we presume, are drawn to prove that the human nature *has* been raised to a personal union with the divine, since the Doctor contends, that they cannot all be predicated of either nature exclusively, and these inferences are themselves to be supposed to be drawn from the New Testament.

We trust that it will not be considered as a dereliction of the honesty of argument, should we adopt as a position, that any gentleman attempt-

ing to establish a new doctrine or the revival of an old one on the foundation of the scriptures, would select from those scriptures such passages as would the most effectually support such doctrine.—Presuming therefore that Dr. Griffin has adopted the strongest passages he could select in his defence, we will examine candidly whether the superstructure is erected as the house of a man founded on a rock or on the sand.

The first ground work he adopts is a verse in the tenth chapter of St. John—we have, as we believe, before remarked on what we consider at least as an indelicacy, the selecting of short passages from the scriptures, insulating them from the main subject with which they are connected, and pressing them so separated into the service of particular purposes.

This was the method adopted by Mr. Thomas Paine when he undertook to invalidate the authenticity of the Pentateuch—he selected a few passages which were originally only marginal notes, but which had afterwards been subjoined to the respective chapters, to prove to the ignorant, that Moses could not have written any part of the five books.

Dr. Griffin, as before observed, refers us to a verse of the 10th chapter of St. John, as a sanction to his observation—that the personal union of the human nature with the divine is so intimate, that with the same lips and in the same sentence, he can apply to both natures the same personal pronoun.—Without attempting an explanation of the Doctor's meaning, which we confess in this and many other passages eludes our acutest investigation, we shall only quote a few verses from a work written for the ignorant, and which being intended to be understood, appears to vulgar capacities more intelligible in its native phrase, than when expounded by the Doctor's elucidations.

“The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy : I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. I am the good shepherd : the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But he that is an hireling and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth : and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep. I am the good shepherd and know my *sheep*, and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father : and I lay down my life for the sheep. And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold : them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice : and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd. Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself : I

have power to take it again. "This commandment have I received of my Father."

In this passage we can see nothing but the declaration of a benevolent Redeemer that he voluntarily sacrifices his life for the good of mankind.

TO THE EDITOR OF SOMETHING.

SIR,

Designed for the last number.

ON Thursday last I attended the public lecture of this town, and returned with feelings deeply impressed of the utility and benevolence of the doctrines I there heard inculcated, which I am happy to announce through the medium of your paper. The exercises by the Rev. Dr. Kirkland, were peculiarly impressive and engaging to every christian hearer. The sermon, without exception was one of the finest in composition and effect, I ever heard delivered; it was truly pulpit eloquence; the subject, the duty of man to man evinced in that active principle, which animates the christian heart—"Love your neighbour as yourself"—and it could not have been more justly and eloquently treated. The christian there found most beautifully illustrated the practice of his life. The contracted bigot would seek there in vain for an encouragement of his illiberal tenets. Christian benevolence breathed throughout the discourse, adorned by those natural graces of diction which indicate an elegant, comprehensive, penetrating, and richly cultivated mind. But the principle, not the splendours in which it was arrayed, demands our admiration, and as such its excellence would be felt unassisted by its decorations. It is a sermon that ought to be written in letters of gold, and impressed upon every heart. As it forcibly speaks to the feelings, and bears conviction to the understanding. These comments cannot convey a just idea of its merit. Its effects upon the auditors is its best eulogy. Those who were so fortunate as to be present at its delivery must join with me in the idea of its excellence. For it assuredly commands the general "tribute of grateful recollection."

"Mild persuasion flowed in eloquence."

L.

Theatre, Monday, Feb. 26th, 1810.

THE BENEVOLENT JEW, AND MIDAS.

WERE we to suffer the impression made on ourselves to be the sole criterion of this comedy on the effects of its performance, we should most unequivocally give it the warmest sanction; but reserving to others the right of deviation, from what appeared to be the general sentiment we shall only offer our own.

To the author we, as christians, think the highest praise is due, for the honourable manner in which he has advocated the character of the persecuted and slandered Jews ; they are children of the same parent whose blessing we as well as they daily implore, and under whose influence they as well as ourselves exist ; if they in all things do not think like us, we should, in charity believe, that they act at least as conscientiously as ourselves.—Were I any other than a christian, says Dr. Watson, I would be a Jew.

To deny to any particular sect the common feelings of humanity, is only to exhibit in the authors of such denials, a want of feeling in themselves ; what principle should naturally or necessarily restrict a Jew from being as benevolent as a christian ? The laws of Moses were as comprehensive, though perhaps not so expletive of our moral duties as those of *our* Saviour ; but are we necessarily to suppose a man is devoid of every feeling of humanity, because he cannot believe that *our* Saviour is *his* Saviour.—Real christians will shrink from so vague a hypothesis.

For the exhibition of the character of the benevolent Jew, we think that Mr. Bernard deserves every praise that can be bestowed on the actor or the man. We are fond of seeing christian principles expanding to the embrace of every thing that is human, and we are doubtful whether we should attribute the higher credit to the author who drew or the actor who performed the character.

Communication.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour of enjoying the acquaintance of a young lady in this town, whose parents are not in the most prosperous condition. I have been very attentive in my demeanour towards her, having invited and gallanted her to numerous places of public amusement. I possess self conceit enough to justify me in asserting that I have gained the affections of her heart ; it could not be otherwise, for, as I am in business for myself, I am of course making money ; and being handsome in person, or at least possessing one requisite—a huge pair of whiskers, am consequently a fit object of her love.

Now, as I am wonderfully sagacious, I have discovered that the parents are no less solicitous than proud of my frequent visits ; for I cannot but observe the many little tricks which are unnecessarily called in-

to action during my presence, and the numerous excuses which are blindly made in order to *accidentally* leave us together. This, evidently or apparently, is nothing else than a one sided invitation to more serious advances; another appearance, by no means unexceptionable, is, that these voluntary and intended *tete a tetes* are meant to insinuate their unbounded reliance on the daughter's virtue, and their implicit confidence in her immaculate purity.

These circumstances, sir, have in some measure tended to disgust me; for, I have no intentions beyond those of employing a few idle hours; nor any desire of approximating nearer to one whose expectations are so very disproportionate to her merits, and whose pride towers to such an immense distance above her capacity.

As there are perhaps many others in similar predicaments, I anticipate a ready insertion of this letter, accompanied with whatever remarks it may suggest in your next Something; in doing which you will oblige,

Your reader,

P. K.

February 28, 1810.

Answer.

WE would recommend to "P. K." to dispossess himself of what in his view, gives him the most irresistible charm, to wit, his whiskers; to divest himself of a large portion of his "self conceit," and to relinquish a still larger portion of his vanity, and he will then perhaps perceive in this premeditated design of the young lady and her parents to encumber him with matrimonial *fetters*, nothing more than the effect of *accident*, and a due regard to civility. Should he on the contrary, find *them* determined on an "approximation" to which he is averse, let him refrain from visiting them altogether; and let his *feet* thereafter carry him only where his *heart* shall prompt him.

N. N.

CELLAR DOORS.

THE inattention paid to the security of Cellar-doors in town, has become a great and growing evil.—The other night as I was passing down a street with a young lady she stepped upon a cellar door—which was level with the side walk, and had every appearance of being secure, but she fell to the bottom of the cellar. I myself walked down a cellar a few months since, which was carelessly left open of a very dark night.—I hope, in the name of humanity, the fathers of the town will adopt some speedy and effectual measures which may secure the safety of our citizens against *falling down cellars* in their night rambles.

Z.

LOUISA ;

A Domestic Tale.

SUDDEN the dreadful tempest came,
The light'nings fire the sky ;
And quick succeeding bursts proclaim
The threat'ned danger nigh.

Louisa, in a lone retreat,
Indulg'd unwitness'd tears ;
While her impatient bosom beat,
With trembling hopes and fears.

Alone she sate, who late had known
The crowd of flatt'ers swarm
To bask them in her fortune's sun ;
Now vanish'd from its storm.

Three hours of night, and darkness wild,
Had mark'd her husband's stay ;
With him had stray'd their only child,
Companion of his way.

More quick and bright the light'nings flash,
More loud the thunders roar ;
But light'ning's blaze, or thunder's crash,
Were seen or heard no more,

When to the mother's anguish'd breast
A distant shriek appeal'd ;
"O God ! my child !" she cried, and prest
Impatient to the field.

A darken'd wood embrac'd the lot ;
A mother could not stray ;
The blaze of heav'n reveal'd the spot
Where, gasping, Emma lay.

"My only child !" the parent cries,
As she her infant prest ;
Father !—the shiv'ring babe replies,
And faints upon her breast.

"Thy father!" shrieks Louisa wild,

"My Henry! art not near?

"Canst thou be absent, and thy child

"Expos'd and dying here?

"What frantic horrors fire my brain!

"My dearest Emma, speak!

Where is thy father? ease my pain,

"Or this poor heart will break."

"I left him struggling with the flood

"Where yonder waters foam;

"He sent for help, and said that God

"Would guide the infant home."

With eager bound Louisa straight

Towards the wild surge prest;

Nor felt the trembling infant's weight

Still clinging to her breast.

Approaching, her bewilder'd shrieks

An aged widow hear'd;

Whose hut amid the wild rocks' breaks

By humble hands was rear'd.

"Here bend your steps" the widow cries,

"And hasten to my aid;"

Louisa paus'd, her bright'ning eyes

A ray of hope display'd.

"Haste! haste! we yet may save his life."

Louisa *paus'd* no more;

Quick as the light'ning's flash, the wife."

Was instant at the door.

Humanity! why is't thy lot

More frequent to be found,

Embosom'd in the lowly cot

Than on exalted ground?

Is't that from nature's warm appeal

By *fortune* we are free?

Or is't, the poor alone who feel

For others' misery?

Louisa's husband, on a bed
Of humble straw was laid ;
But to redeem him from the dead,
An angel toil'd and pray'd.

An angel—not as poets paint
In outward grace, and youth ;
But far more like a *heav'nly* saint,
In charity and truth.

She pray'd, as each kind help she bore,
O come, returning life !
A parent to a child restore,
A husband to a wife.

Louisa, rous'd from transient veil
Of sense, now join'd the task ;
Meanwhile, the widow told the tale
Louisa dar'd not ask.

"As shrouded in this lowly vale,
"I bless'd my humble fate,
"That shielded me from storms' assail,
"The lofty and the great,

"The tempest howl'd along the strand ;
"But unappall'd I heard ;
"They never *dread* th' Almighty's *hand*,
"Who reverence his *word*.

"I am not learn'd, but common sense
"Instructs that Heaven's rage,
"Can ne'er by youthful innocence
"Be fear'd, or well spent age.

"But while I prais'd the God of all,
"I heard a wretch's cry—
"I instant hasten'd to the call—
" 'Twas but humanity.

"Tost by the waves your husband laid ;
"He cried or breath'd no more ;
"The God of mercy lent his aid,
"I dragg'd him to the shore.

"By this I felt my strength reviv'd,
"This act my youth renew'd ;
"With ease I brought him where I liv'd,
"And plac'd him as you view'd.

"Yet, yet may life return." She ceas'd,
And rais'd to heaven her eyne,
Which shone, though dim with age, as kiss'd
By charity divine.

Distraught Louisa, in despair,
Heard but her Henry's knell ;
"He's gone," she cry'd, "and I shall ne'er
"Bid more than this farewell.

"Then sound, my infant, sound the toll
"By filial duty due ;
"And breathe to his departing soul
"One soft but last adieu."

She said, and on his death-stamp'd corse
The trembling Emma plac'd ;
And never death unwelcom'd, was
By innocence more grac'd.

The weeping infant sobb'd adieu
Through his half op'ning lips—
Death, friend of innocence, withdrew ;
Life started from eclipse.

The parent breathed ;—Louisa's hope
Full glisten'd in her eye ;
"Ah no," she cried, "my life's sole prop,
"Thou shalt not, shalt not die ;

"This innocent a sigh has heav'd
"Which not in vain implor'd ;
"That breath which she from thee receiv'd ;
"She has to thee restored.

"Yes, heaven hath sav'd thee from the wave,"
She said—but, speaking, caught
The widow's eye, which seem'd to crave
For *human* love a thought.

"O yes," she cried, "to thee indeed

"My gratitude is due ;

"But heav'n the happy act *decreed*,

"Though 'twas *assign'd* to you.

"And thus for time and life well spent

"Will God the good regard ;

"By making them his *instrument*

"Of mercy and reward.

"And when from earth thou'rt call'd to heav'n,

"Thou from the eternal throne,

"Shalt hear this blessed judgment giv'n,

"By thee my will was done."

GAMING.

PLATO being informed that one of his disciples was fond of gaming, reprimanded him for it. The disciple excused himself by saying, that he only played for a trifle. "But," said Plato, "do you reckon for nothing the *habit* of gaming, which playing for a trifle will make you contract."

February 23, 1810.

NEMO NOBODY, ESQ.

SIR—Having accidentally a few evenings ago, read several numbers of your publication entitled "Something"—permit, sir, an unlettered stranger, to express her sincere admiration of a work evidently tending in her view, to the improvement of our minds and morals, and to the cultivation of taste. If all men would like you, justly appreciate our value, with what avidity should we cultivate our minds, instead of adorning our persons ; with what solicitude would our mothers and instructors prune our minds of those destructive and noxious weeds, vanity and dissimulation, which when they have once, from custom and a wrong education, been suffered to take root, can seldom if ever be eradicated ! Believe me, sir, I am far from wishing to advocate the rights of woman, as Mrs. Godwin has been pleased to term them ; far from it, I would not for the universe (if conscious of it,) be the means of promoting principles that are in their nature pernicious ; and in my humble opinion, have been productive of real and lasting mischief and unhappiness, in many worthy families. So far from wishing to usurp those prerogatives that nature has so justly given to your sex, that you might be our pro-

tectors, our guardians, and our support ; I never feel myself so happy as, when I am indebted to your sex for that protection which the feebleness of our nature, makes me conscious was intended by an all-wise Creator for us ; and to whom we ought ever to look up, not as our masters, but as our first and best friends ; in whose honourable bosoms we can quietly repose our sorrows and our griefs ; whose labours are devoted to our happiness and ease, and whose lives would cheerfully be sacrificed in defence of our reputation, and honour.

I am, Sir, with respect, yours,

EUPHEMIA.

Theatre, Wednesday, Feb. 28th, 1810.

TEKELI, AND VALENTINE & ORSON.

THE former of these pieces has had (to use a theatrical phrase) a very uncommon run, and we had some time ago nothing to induce us to hope for a repetition of it, but that the managers had advertised it positively for the last time.

We hope that Valentine and Orson will soon be advertised as positively for the last time, for then we shall have reason to expect its performance at least three times more.

TO LOUNGERS.

MR. EDITOR,

SIR—I am a man of business, having lately attempted an establishment in a mercantile profession. My success hitherto has more than equalled my expectations, and I confidently anticipate an ample reward for all my care and exertions. In the pursuit of my business I have procured myself many acquaintances, and amongst those acquaintances, several friends, in whose society and friendship I at all times, when at leisure, partake of much pleasure and enjoyment. The greatest difficulty which I experience is, that among this numerous acquaintance, there are many who frequently make my store a place of resort to spend an idle hour in frivolous conversation, or otherwise, to the no small interruption to a regular and timely discharge of my concerns, by engaging or diverting my attention from such persons as come there for the purpose of transacting business, or in a way which is still worse, by collecting particularly on days when the weather is more than ordinarily cold, and placing themselves in clusters, or in a circle around the fire, and thus preventing any one in the store from approaching it, and consequently obstructing every particle or ray of heat from finding its way into the room, and thereby obviating the possibility of those, for whom it is particularly

designed, from receiving any benefit therefrom, and at the same time rendering them unfit for the business of the store, by causing them to stand exposed in the cold till they are become chilled almost to a state of petrification. My civilities or a desire to obtain the friendship of all who call upon me, as well as an unwillingness to offend any one, necessarily oblige me to endure it, though highly prejudicial to my business, and contrary to my inclination. As they are almost or nearly all of them patrons, and to my knowledge constant readers of your paper, will you have the goodness to insert this, and to suggest to them the impolicy, or rather the impropriety of thus abusing civilities and proffered hospitality extended to them in a store. Having no leisure in business hours myself, as in my opinion no industrious man ever should have, be pleased to inform them that at such times it will be altogether inconvenient to receive them, except on matters of business ; but that in seasonable hours for relaxation from the fatigues and cares of the day, they may command a due share of both the time and friendship of their as well as your friend,

R.

March 2, 1810.

FEMALES.

"It was only a woman's remark."

THIS expression roused me from a pleasant contemplation in which my mind had been engaged ; I started with horror at the observation—But turning my eyes toward that part of the room, whence the voice issued, I confess that I felt my indignation in some degree appeased, by perceiving that the words had issued from the mouth of a young man. I reflected—and pitied him. In a few minutes I left the house.

"Only a woman's remark !" I repeated as I was walking home—But no matter—'twas but the observation of a youth, who, perhaps had been acquainted solely with such as bear alone the female form. At that moment flashed on my mind names which I dare not mention of women—really women, "heaven's first best gift to man." Cold as was the evening I stopped and meditated on the ignorance of the observation—"Only a woman's remark," was repeated involuntarily, and reiterated with all the changes of emphasis of which the sentence would admit—yet remained I in the deepest perplexity with respect to the possible appropriate allusion. What could the young man mean ? had he formed any improper idea of the qualification of females from his own observation, or had he acquired like a parrot, this remark from the tongues of others ?—Pshaw, said I, as a pinching breeze reminded me of the imprudence of midnight contemplation in the street—he knows nothing of the

sex; and having flattered and warmed my own mind with a reflection that I knew them better, I hastened home, and passed some delicious hours in contemplating the characters of those females whose virtues and abilities have conferred the *highest* honour on mankind.

MADAME CAT-ALINA.

During the performance at the theatre last evening, a cat by some means was introduced into the lobbies, and gave a short specimen of her musical powers. A wit remarked that this was a treat extra; as Madam Cat-alina had not been announced in the bills to *sing* this evening.

TO THE EDITOR OF SOMETHING.

SIR—I AM an occasional though not a frequent visitor at the theatre. Whenever I have been there of late, I have uniformly been almost literally *stared out of countenance*, by a young gentleman, who places himself in a direction and attitude which it is wholly impossible for me to avoid when my attention is directed toward the stage. Pray Sir, is it not considered rudeness, because at the theatre, thus to stare a person continually in the face? If so, be pleased to warn him against a repetition of such ill manners; but if not, I must solicit your advice to know what course of conduct I ought to adopt to avoid or prevent it.

Yours, ISSABELLA.

DESPAIR AND HOPE.

As onward through *life's* troublous sea
My wayward barque is driven,
With adverse gales and madd'ning waves,
In twain is nearly riven.

As onward still by storms impell'd
I near the gulph DESPAIR,
HOPE points to *heaven* with cheering smile,
My anchorage is there.

R.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Consistency," &c. is under serious consideration; we will, with his permission, make some use of his letter in our next, although we cannot publish it in its entire state.—C. will perceive that we have enough on a certain subject in this number already.

M. N. we cannot understand, and P. O. is too intelligible.

ERRATA.

Among others of a trifling nature, we are sorry to observe the following in this number:

Page 244, 20th line, "poets" for facts.